DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 780 CS 501 591

AUTHOR Beasley, Mary Fowler
TITLE The Persistenacity of Public Address.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (San Antonio, Texas, April 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Skills; *Course Objectives; *Educational Needs; Educational Philosophy; *Group Discussion; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Public Speaking; *Speech Instruction

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a rationale for combining public speaking with interpersonal communication and group discussion, in basic speech courses. A survey of textbook authors, administrators, teachers, and students reveals that most feel that the public-speaking approach, alone or in conjunction with other approaches, continues to be the most valid for their needs. Those who are interested in implementing the public-speaking approach should place emphasis on the innovation of ideas and on research into the effectiveness of the basic speech course. (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED133780

THE PERSISTENACITY OF PUBLIC ADDRESS

Mary Fowler Beasley

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Fowler Beasley

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

*Dr. Beasley, Ph.D. Purdue University, is Associate Professor of Speech at Louisiana Tech University.

CS 501 591

THE PERSISTENACITY OF PUBLIC ADDRESS

Sung to the tune of the Peter Pan Peanut Butter commercial jingle: "Do you believe in public speaking? Ya gotta believe----" Our meeting "motto" calls us to survey and analysis, not to debate or persuasion, and yet the title of my paper and the one to follow seem to imply the defense of a public speaking orientation vs. a defense of interpersonal communication in the basic course. Yet I'm not sure if I'm affirmative or negative--for good ol' status quo public speaking--or if interpersonal communication has become the status quo and I'm the one advocating a change--back to good ol' public speaking. However, I have recently become a local politician, and have therefore acquired some experience in mugwumping and an earnest desire to please all the people all the time. I hesitate to offend those of you who, like one of the participants evaluating the October, 1975 Southern Speech Communication Workshop on the Basic Course, see "the infight among Speech (Public Speaking) and Interpersonal people" as not useful.[1] Despite my need to refer to interpersonal communication in discussing the persistenacity of public address, then, I hope you will find that I have left my "Stamp Out Interpersonal Communication" button at home.

This analysis will use two basic divisions: a discussion of description, in terms of what the basic course is, and a discussion of prescription, in terms of what speech professionals and others think that the basic course should be. Because of my limitations and those of our field, neither area will be complete or definitive, but perhaps the discussion will be thought-provoking and "further study-generating" rather than simply provoking.

Let's look first at the descriptive area. In analyzing or examining the basic course in order to determine its composition, we frequently think of one major component as the "course content," including both theory and practice.

Paper presented at the Southern Speech Communication Association Convention, San Antonio, Texas, April 8, 1976.

We have had, through the years, a number of surveys which study the content of the basic course. Norman T. London in 1964 cited surveys on the purpose and nature of the first course in speech published in 1949, 1950, 1952, and 1956.[2] The earlier surveys as well as London's own survey showed an overwhelming public speaking orientation. In the London survey, more specifically, the "extemporaneous speaking" method was being given major emphasis in teaching and practice in over 90 per cent of the institutions reporting. Dedmon and Frandsen, also in 1964, found that over half the required first courses in institutions responding to their survey described their courses as "practical public speaking" courses and that an additional 30 per cent used a combination of approaches with public speaking as the major emphasis.[3]

In October, 1967, a systematic effort began, under the auspices of what was then the Undergraduate Speech Instruction Interest Group of the Speech Communication Association, to monitor the status of the basic course. The committee charged with this responsibility used the survey method, obtaining in 1968 what they considered to be a representative sample of the basic course in junior colleges, colleges, and universities.[4] The group reported these findings:

> It is apparent that since 1963-64, a sizable number of schools have shifted their "declared" emphasis from public speaking or fundamentals to communication or "multiple" approaches. Nevertheless, the basic course in nearly 50 per cent of the colleges, universities, and junior colleges continues to have a public speaking or fundamentals emphasis.[5]

The committee observed that more than three-fourths of the courses used the term "public speaking" or "fundamentals" in the course title. Further, detailed analysis of the data from the schools indicated that the course content of many reporting a "communication" orientation actually centered on what the committee considered public speaking, and that the textbooks most frequently used, even in many of the "communication" courses, had a public address emphasis.[6]

The second and most recent of the surveys in the SCA effort to monitor the status of the basic course was reported in 1974,[7] based on a survey made in late 1973. The committee found that, compared to five years before, there was an apparent reduction in courses emphasizing public speaking, fundamentals, and voice and articulation, and an increase in courses emphasizing a multiple approach. The multiple approach was named by the largest group, 39.4 per cent; communication was reported by 24.5 per cent; public speaking by 21.3 per cent; and fundamentals by 12.8 per cent.[8] It might be obvious to thoughtful readers that the one-choice categorizing labels listed without definition or description to guide respondents or later report readers seem to overlap and are ambiguous. The course that I call "communication," for instance, could easily emphasize public address--yet I might label it "communication" for the course catalog and on the survey form to make it seem more palatable or "with it."[9]

The committee itself speculated, as in the earlier survey, that the apparent change in orientation might be more a change in name than a change from the traditional public speaking course content. Detailed data revealed that a large majority of those reporting required the delivery of 4 to 10 speeches and many required 1 to 3 speeches. Much course time was given to public speaking-related lecture topics.[10] Further, the most frequently used textbooks were still public speaking oriented, although interpersonal textbooks were increasing in popularity.[11] As the authors state in their summary, "courses may have been re-named or designated as 'communication' courses or courses reflecting a 'multiple' approach (including 'communication') because of the assumed attractiveness of the word communication."[12]

The committee survey also concluded that among all types of courses, despite some suggestion in our journals that theory-only courses should supplant theory and practice courses,[13] the large majority of courses used a combination of theory and practice, with more time spent on performance than on theory in all types of beginning courses.[14]

It is also evident that of the many articles concerning specific improvements in the basic course in the 1960's and 1970's (except those suggesting a change to the interpersonal approach), almost all envisioned the public-address oriented basic course as the setting or context for the authors' suggestions concerning team teaching, use of model speeches and common materials, contract grading, simulation games, closed-circuit television, and videotaping.[15] Unless the various authors of recent articles, from many universities and training backgrounds, have been completely insensitive to trends, their basic assumption of a public address course seems to speak to what is still the "norm."

Surveys have attempted to discover what the basic course composition is with regard to content--the theories and skills that are taught and/or practiced. It is clear from our earlier discussion that our surveys are imperfect with regard to designating and describing what we mean by our categories when we ask respondents to categorize, and we are left with educated guesses in that area of course composition. Course composition can also include the consumers of the course. Let's see if we fare better in discussing who takes the basic course. Our very definition of the basic course, since we can't generalize on the basis of content, seems to stem to some degree from the course consumers. The 1968 SCA committee survey defined the basic course as "... that course either required or recommended for a signficant number of undergraduates; it is that speech course which the department either has [recommended] or would recommend as being required for all or most undergraduates if the college administration asked it to name a course so required."[16] Bert Bradley accepts this definition in lieu of a more precise one as a basis for his discussion of the basic course, noting that the wide variance in course content does not enable us to use content as a basis for definition.[17]

Who, then, are the consumers? We can generalize little about them except that they are those undergraduates who are guided, by requirement or

recommendation, into the basic speech course. The surveys discussed earlier reveal that the large majority of undergraduates are still required to take the basic course. The most recent SCA survey showed that course enrollments in most institutions in 1973 were stable or increasing over five years before, and that the growth rate in the basic course was the same as or greater than the overall institutional growth pattern. The most recent class size reports indicate, as did earlier reports, that classes are kept small at most colleges and universities, usually 18 to 22 students.[19]

Our description of the consumer of the basic course could also include the decision-makers in the various academic curricula or "major" areas who continue to require or recommend that students in those majors take the basic speech course. Even the employers of the students who take our basic course and the taxpayers who help subsidize it could be considered "far-out" subfactors of this "consumer" factor in our description of the basic course. Whether the speech skill needs and desires of students, (needs and desires as <u>we</u> see them and/or as <u>they</u> see them), academic major decision makers, employers, and taxpayers is a valid consideration in deciding what the basic course <u>should be</u> is a matter for our "prescriptive" section.

Another signficant factor in our analysis by description is the teacher of the basic course. Some of our surveys of the basic course have considered whether "regular" faculty or graduate assistants teach the course. The most recent survey found that despite economic pressures, there has been no decided trend toward the assumption by graduate students of a large part of the basic course load.[20] However, I have found no recent survey of the suitability of the training and experience of instructors of the basic course in qualifying them to teach whatever approach is taken to the basic course in that instructor's college or university. This lack of data in the descriptive area will weaken our discussion in the prescriptive area.

We have had problems of definition in our attempt to discover what is happening in the basic course. How much more complex will our task become now, as we turn to the views of speech professionals and speech course consumers concerning what should be happening? Let's go back to my opening commercial. Following the original peanut butter jingle beginning, "Do you believe in peanut butter," Peter Pan inquires, "Do you believe?" All respondents, from appropriately plump urchins to elderly grandmas, reply cooperatively, "I believe" in turn. Our believers in public speaking are among the most respected names in the profession. Among them are authors of textbocks and new editions of textbooks since 1970 who apparently have made believers out of their publishers. For example, a new 1972 basic course textbook by Bert Bradley states that "this book is focused upon the beginning course in oral communication or public speaking."[21] Charles Gruner, Cal Logue, Dwight Freshley, and Richard Huseman in their 1974 basic course textbook[22] make strong points in the preface for the persistenacity of public address, although they nod to the interpersonal trend by including chapters on interpersonal communication. In a 1976 text which emphatically moves "back to fundamentals" as its title declares, the same authors state specifically, "Whereas our book Speech Communication in Society [1972] was written for the basic course which includes both public speaking and interpersonal communication, this work...is written for the public-speaking oriented course...in general this is a new work."[23] Bryant and Wallace, in their fourth edition of the short version of their basic course textbook (1976), make specific reference to "some of the other important points of view" in the field (including the interpersonal approach), which they suggest as additional readings at the ends of chapters.[24] Obviously, however, in revising both this text and the fifth edition of their longer and even more popular Fundamentals of Public Speaking,[25] which are both definitely oriented toward

public speaking, Bryant and Wallace are believers. Although rummaging in my own attic could hardly qualify as a scholarly and acceptable survey, I note that there are on my shelves 14 basic course textbooks out since 1970 that do not even mention interpersonal communication; their contents do not seem influenced to any significant degree by the interpersonal approach.

On the other hand, only one of the 17 predominantly interpersonal textbooks on my shelves omits any reference to public speaking. Some at least acknowledge the past predominance of public address before defending their departure from it. Most incorporate some "public speaking skills" into a basically interpersonal textbook, apparently saying with Boreman and Bormann that "We have not...ignored the still-useful tradition that comes from a study of rhetoric and public speaking in regard to such matters as the use of evidence, the organization of messages, and the delivery of public speeches."[26] In the preface to the second edition of their basic text, Wiseman and Barker observe that"...many schools recognize that while communication theory and ideas are important, theory and practice in public speaking are still vital; and we retain key aspects of the latter."[27] Brooks states in his preface to the second edition of his popular Speech Communication that he rejected a narrow treatment in his introductory text because "It was clear that the students and teachers using the text appreciated the broad approach that provided a framework for relating intrapersonal, interpersonal, public, and cultural communication."[28]

As interpersonal authors have included material on public speaking, so public address authors have included interpersonal themes. Baird, Knower, and Becker in the fourth edition of their basic text report that "Though Essentials of General Speech Communication does not minimize formal speaking, it enlarges its scope to focus on a variety of the communication experiences which a student will encounter in the post-academic world.[29]

Wiseman and Barker even go as far as to state that public speaking itself should be considered as interpersonal communication: "The intent of our first edition was to stimulate students to view public speaking as interpersonal communication...The second edition maintains the position that public speaking should be interpersonal in nature...."[30] Tubbs and Moss seem to concur, reporting that they place public speaking "Within the total context of human communication" and asserting that most of the material on interpersonal communication can be applied by the public speaker as well.[31] Gruner and colleagues have the same idea with "reverse emphasis"; they cite Brigance's belief that public speaking should have many of the characteristics of "'enlarged conversation,'" adding that "The study and practice of public speaking can make a person a better speaker in all situations"--obviously implying that public speaking skills can be applied to interpersonal communication.[32]

It is clear that many recent textbooks are including material which could be designated "interpersonal" to a greater or lesser degree. Their prefaces prescribe an interpersonal approach, a public speaking approach, or a "combination" approach. Rationales for these recommendations are often included in the prefaces and are more fully developed in journal articles by textbook authors and other speech professionals. However, Bert Bradley uses a number of journal articles to show that we often disagree about what interpersonal communication is in the first place. He proceeds to argue, with his definite pro-public speaking bias, that we are abandoning public speaking for interpersonal communication on the basis of faulty assumptions about both.[33] He advocates further study and research into the purposes and personnel of the basic course and into how best to serve the personnel,[34] a recommendation with which I heartily concur. In the meantime, however, let us look at the reasons that some speech professionals prescribe public

speaking, both theory and practice, in the basic source.

Defenders of the public speaking approach, like defenders of interpersonal communication, argue that the consumer of the course--the student--benefits from the public speaking approach. Although it is clear, as interpersonalists observe, that people spend far more communication time in interpersonal situations than in public address situations,[35] defenders of public address do not concede that "time spent" equals relevance or importance. Some authors state or imply that structured, pre-planned "public speech" messages are far more difficult and therefore more worthy of study in a college course.[36] But the traditional view of the importance of public address to society as presented in countless introductory chapters of basic texts is this, as stated by Gruner and colleagues in their preface to Speech Communication in Society: "We have also tailored this book for use in public speech-oriented courses without apology because we strongly feel that the educated citizen has not only the right, but the duty to be a responsible and vocal citizen."[37] As if in answer to the interpersonalists, they add, "...we believe, with Aristotle, that the study of public speaking is justifiable even if the student does not subsequently practice the craft actively--since he needs to know the craft in order to defend himself against it as used by the politician, the salesman, and the advertiser."[38] Our texts stress critical listening skills in the basic course. Bradley cites studies by Kathleen Kendall and Stacks and Gordon to show that public speaking may be done much more after graduation than we think it is, and to suggest that we need more research into the frequency and importance of the public speaking of college students after graduation.[39]

There are those who refer to the basic course as the "service" course. The preceding discussion of service to the consumer was from our more knowledgeable and experienced (?) viewpoint as we considered what the student as an individual and a group member in society needs. Although many of us

resist "the customer is always right" philosophy that would allow students to tell us what they want from the basic course, some proponents of the interpersonal approach use the "more satisfied customer" as a reason to change from public speaking to the interpersonal approach.[40] Mehrley and Backes discuss the negative image of the public speaking orientation in the basic course and call for revolutionary change to a communication approach which will improve our image with students, academic area heads who require the course, and other faculty.[41] Conversations with colleagues from schools which have begun to emphasize interpersonal communication reveal that these colleagues attribute some of the customer satisfaction to the significantly higher grades that have accompanied the change. Robert M. Smith describes the far greater popularity of the interpersonal course over the public speaking course at Wichita State University, where students have a choice. However, he states that its popularity, in his view, is probably due to the fact that "younger, and somewhat more exciting teachers" teach the interpersonal course, that students are avoiding public speaking rather than specifically choosing interpersonal, that students receive slightly higher grades for the interpersonal course, and other factors which have "nothing to do with a dichotomy between the content in the specific courses."[42] Some colleagues complain, in conversation, that students like the interpersonal course because all they have to do is be cooperative and friendly during class and they get A's or B's in performance.

We have no broad survey data that I could discover on how students themselves compare and rate the two basic approaches. In January, 1975, I conducted an unscientific survey at Louisiana Tech University among upper-level speech students who had been exposed to both approaches, and was surprised to find that 29 of the 35 surveyed felt that both speech majors and non-majors would find the public speaking approach in the first course more valuable than the interpersonal. The same number felt that in a multiple

approach, emphasis should be on public speaking. Lohr's 1974 survey of University of Iowa Alumni found that although social conversation, giving information, and decision-making with one person were used most frequently, various types of speaking to a group were ranked as most difficult. The alumni recommended the giving of various types of public speeches much more highly than they recommended various types of interpersonal activities or discussion. As Lohr observes, "The results of this study suggest that public speaking training should receive strong emphasis in a Fundamentals Speech Course. Four public speaking activities topped the list of recommended activities."[43] Again, we need more data to draw firm conclusions about student desires. Yet we do have some data which might indicate that frequency of later use, popularity, and perceived value might not necessarily be the same.

We also suggested that the major academic area decision makers, the employers of students, and even the taxpayers might be considered consumers of the basic course. We could become even more indirect and state that society as a whole is the consumer. The education major who becomes a first grade teacher and influences the speech of his students could illustrate the "ripple" effect. We are given to speculation what these "consumers" need, but again we lack data.

Some speech departments apparently allow other academic areas to choose the sort of basic course they will require of their majors.[44] Some of my colleagues maintain in conversation that other academic areas want their majors to be taught public speaking. But are the academic area decision-makers aware of their options? Surveys and studies have been made to discover what communication skills employers want from their employees at various levels,[45] but even here our data is sketchy and we are not sure employers can make a wise choice if they are not familiar with all our wares.

In the area of the "other consumers," perhaps we need to inform our consumers and then survey them. We could find out which academic areas and which employers do not specifically require certain communication courses or skills for their personnel, and why. Other studies of our consumers' needs and desires--from our point of view and theirs--could be undertaken.

We have a prescription also concerning the size of the course. We generally prefer the smaller size class, perhaps 18-22 students, for the course in both the interpersonal and the public address performance approaches.[46] Although many of us would not prescribe as ideal a situation in which large lecture sections emphasizing theory and not practice prevail, some, such as East and Starkey, have suggested this approach for economic reasons.[47] The East and Starkey approach combines a large lecture course in rhetoric (200-250 students) with small performance sections (25-27 students each). Kirn and Taylor, however, discuss the non-performance "liberal arts" approach which is analytical and historical and which trains the student in making value judgements and stimulates his imagination as a "model" approach,[48] and Bevilacqua offers rhetorical theory to satisfy "students' demand for substantive courses in speech which offer subject matter of historical and philosophical importance."[49] Advantages of the non-performance approach include the economic advantage of using large sections if necessary, but speech professionals who favor a non-performance course and a course using large rather than small sections seem to be in the minority.

The teacher of the basic course has also been prescribed. Bradley notes the widespread use of senior faculty members rather than almost exclusive use of graduate assistants and other junior staff members as had been expected with budget restrictions. He feels that the use of senior faculty is "a recognition of the importance of the basic courses to our various departments and our discipline." He adds that one important way to attract students as speech majors is to use "the most experienced and

successful members of the department" in the basic course.[50] Although a teacher's success (?), attractiveness to students, training, and experience may or may not be correlated, and although we have little idea of the kinds of skills that are necessary for the interpersonal and the public speaking teacher to be a "good" teacher, we do well to question. We do not have enough data to prescribe specifically, but Loren Reed's advice to contemporary speech teacher apprentices is this: "Prophecy is hazardous, probably those first courses that put a major emphasis on speech making will continue in the majority, but the fundamentals teacher should be training in group process as well as in speechmaking."[51] We assume, although the assumption may be false, that most of our first course teachers have training in speechmaking. We prescribe training in interpersonal skills, but are we now equipped, as a profession, to teach the interpersonal course? John Stewart says that the interpersonal course "does not require the teacher to be a clinical psychologist, but it does require a commitment to students as a human being."[52] He adds, "Our experience with this approach indicates that it is sometimes frustrating. The approach requires many changes on the part of both students and teachers."[53] The necessary changes were seen and stated more bluntly by one of my speech students: "If you use this interpersonal approach, too many changes would have to be made. You'd have to become a psychiatrist and I'd have to become psychotic to take the course."

Again, we lack data for our prescription of the ideal teacher for both approaches. Perhaps we should collect data, analyze it, and formulate guidelines in the building and maintenance of good basic course teachers.

One final criterion: we always prescribe course "effectiveness" as an obviously implied, if not stated, assumption. Bradley discusses the problems we have with determining our effectiveness in the basic course. He suggests that false judgments of our purpose and lack of effectiveness

in using the public address approach to the basic course have led to our apparent shift to interpersonal communication.[54] Yet the public speaking approach was considered effective under the definition of effectiveness used by Faules, Littlejohn, and Ayers.[55] We know too little about effectiveness in the basic course. Some have found the problem of effectiveness to be related to the larger "speech" problem of uniqueness and specific purpose. The February, 1975, presidential message of SCA president Herman Cohen speaks indirectly to our problem,[56] as do Keltner and Henning.[57]

What, then, shall we conclude? One conclusion is that we know very little from which to draw a conclusion. We need to do much more research. Basically though, we can conlude descriptively that we find that the public speaking orientation, but that name or any other, is still in use in many, if not most, basic courses. We can conclude prescriptively that many textbook authors, administrators, teachers, and thoughtful students feel that the public speaking approach, alone or in combination with other approaches, continues to be the most valid for their needs. It is possible, however, that the incumbent has become recumbent. We who are interested in the public speaking approach should bring innovative ideas into our work. We should find ways to combine public speaking with interpersonal communication and group discussion, and give training in asking and responding to questions from the audience following prearranged presentations. Talk-back sessions, one-on-one discussions after the speech, "reverse" forums in which the speaker asks the questions and the audience members answer, pre- and post-tests, and other means of combining interpersonal approaches with public speaking could be used.

Like peanut butter, public speaking can be combined with other ingredients, such as the jelly of interpersonal communication, to make an excellent sandwich.

But alone or in combination, public address is persistent and tenacious--just like peanut butter, it sticks to the roof of your course. Do you believe in public speaking? Ya gotta belive...!

NOTES

[1]"Workshop on the Basic Courses: Workshop Evaluation Form Answers," Georgia State University, October 16-18, 1975, p. 5. (Mimeographed)

[2]Norman T. London, "Professional Attitudes Toward a First Course in Speech and Its Requirement in American Colleges," Speech Teacher, 13 (1964), 25.

[3]Donald N. Dedmon and Kenneth D. Frandsen, "The 'Required' First Course in Speech: A Survey," Speech Teacher, 13 (1964), 32.

[4]James W. Gibson, Charles R. Gruner, William D. Brooks, and Charles R. Petrie, Jr., "The First Course in Speech: A Survey of U. S. Colleges and Universities," Speech Teacher, 19 (1970), 13-20.

[5]Gibson, et al., p. 14.

[6]Gibson, et al., p. 15. Also see p. 20. The authors reiterate in their conclusion that despite the use of the term "communication" to describe course orientation, many courses still appeared to be public speaking.

[7]James W. Gibson, John A. Kline, and Charles R. Gruner, "A Re-examination of the First Course in Speech at U. S. Colleges and Universities," Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 206-214.

[8]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 207

[9]Jerry E. Mandel and Ronald L. Applebaum, in "An Investigation of Student Preferences: Basic Speech Course Titles and Descriptions," Speech Teacher, 20 (1971), 146-148, discuss the clear preference that students have for the term "communication" over the term "public speaking" in course titles, and further speculate that the image of "communication" is favorable and positive because of the many references in the media and elsewhere to the need for communication in society.

[10]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 208.

[11]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 210.

[12]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 213.

[13]See examples given in the prescriptive area to follow.

[14]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 210.

[15]The author used the Matlon index, particularly the index of the Speech Teacher, to find articles to skim as the basis for this statement. A complete list would be too long to include here. See Ronald J. Matlon and Irene R. Matlon, Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1974 (Falls Church, Virginia: Speech Communication Association of America, 1975).

[16]Gibson, et al. (1970), p. 13.

[17]Bert E. Bradley, "Basic Communication Courses: State of the Art" (unpublished paper presented to the Southern Speech Association Workshop on the Basic Course, Georgia State University, October 16, 1975), p. 2.

[18]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 209.

[19]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 209.

[20]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 214.

[21]Bert E. Bradley, Fundamentals of Speech Communication: the Credibility of Ideas (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown, 1974), p. xi.

[22]Charles R. Gruner, Cal M. Logue, Dwight L. Freshley, and Richard Huseman, Speech Communication in Society (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972).

[23]Charles Gruner, Cal Logue, Dwight Freshley, and Richard Huseman, Speaking: Back to Fundamentals (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976), p. ix.

[24]Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Oral Communication: A Short Course in Speech (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. ix.

[25]Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976).

[26]Ernest G. Bormann and Nancy Bormann, Speech Communication: An Interpersonal Approach (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), p. x.

[27]Gordon Wiseman and Larry Barker, Speech/Interpersonal Communication (New York: Chandler, 1974), p. xiv.

[28]William D. Brooks, Speech Communication (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1974), p. ix.

[29]A. Craig Baird, Franklin H. Knower, and Samuel Becker, Essentials of General Speech Communication (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. x.

[30]Wiseman and Barker, p. xiii.

[31]Stewart L. Tubbs and Sylvia Moss, Human Communication: An Interpersonal Perspective (New York: Random House, 1974), p. xi.

[32]Gruner, et al. Speech Communication in Society, p. x.

[33]Bradley, pp. 2-18.

[34]Bradley, pp. 18-19.

[35]For discussions of the advantages of the interpersonal approach with regard to time spent and relevance to later life, see Theodore F. Nelson, "Recapturing Enthusiasm for the Fundamentals Course," Speech Teacher, 19 (1970), 289-290; Arthur P. Bochner and Clifford W. Kelly, "Interpersonal

Competence: Rationale, Philosophy, and Implementation of a Conceptual Framework, Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 279; John Stewart, "An Interpersonal Approach to the Basic Course," Speech Teacher, 21 (1972), 7-14.

[36]See, for example, John Dunling, The Audience, the Message, the Speaker (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p. viii.

[37]Gruner, et al., Society, p. xi.

[38]Gruner, et al., Society, p. xi.

[39]Bradley, "State of the Art," pp. 9-10.

[40]Perhaps I exaggerate, but see Stewart, p. 14, and Nelson, p. 295.

[41]R. Samuel Mehrley and James G. Backes, "The First Course in Speech: A Call for Revolution," Speech Teacher, 21 (1972), 205-207.

[42]Letter to the author, March 15, 1976.

[43]James W. Lohr, "Alumni Use of Communication Activity and Recommended Activity for the Basic Course: A Survey," Speech Teacher, 23 (1974), 251.

[44]Bradley, "State of the Art," p. 2.

[45]See, for example, suggested readings in William C. Tacey, Business and Professional Speaking (New York: Wm. C. Brown, 1972).

[46]Gibson, et al. (1974), p. 209.

[47]James R. East and Eleanor Starkey, "The First Speech Course: Rhetoric and Public Address," Speech Teacher 15 (1966), 69-76.

[48]John F. Kirn and Pat M. Taylor, "A Liberal Arts Approach to Speech," Speech Teacher 17 (1968), 34-37.

[49]Vincent M. Bevilacqua, "An Introduction to Rhetoric as a First Course in Speech," Speech Teacher, 14 (1965), p. 1.

[50]Bradley, "State of the Art," p. 7.

[51]Loren Reed, Teaching Speech (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 90.

[52]Stewart, p. 9.

[53]Stewart, p. 14.

[54]Bradley, pp. 7-17.

[55]Don F. Faules, Steve Littlejohn, and Joe Ayres, "An Experimental Study of the Comparative Effects of Three Instructional Methods on Speaking Effectiveness," Speech Teacher, 21 (1972), 46-52.

[56]Herman Cohen, "Presidential Message," Spectra, 11 (February, 1975), pp. 1-2.

[57]John W. Keltner and James H. Henning, "The Unique Function of a Department of Speech in the College and University," Speech Teacher, 22 (1973), 125-127.